

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

HAROLD B. WILSON, and
GRACY SEDLAK,

Plaintiffs,

v.

JOSEPH PLETCHER, and
ORA THOMAS FLETCHER,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 4:12CV3061

MEMORANDUM
AND ORDER

This matter is before the court on its own motion. The above-captioned matter was provisionally filed on March 30, 2012. (Filing No. [1](#).) However, due to certain technical defects, the Complaint cannot be further processed as to Plaintiff Gracy Sedlak ("Sedlak") until such defects are corrected. To assure further consideration of the Complaint, Sedlak must correct the defect listed below. **FAILURE TO CORRECT THE DEFECT MAY RESULT IN DISMISSAL OF THE PETITION.**

Sedlak has failed to include the \$350.00 filing fee. Sedlak has the choice of either tendering the \$350.00 fee to the Clerk of the court or submitting a request to proceed in forma pauperis and an affidavit of poverty in support thereof. If Sedlak chooses to do the latter, the enclosed pauper's forms should be completed and returned to this court.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Sedlak is directed to correct the above-listed technical defect in the Complaint on or before May 24, 2012;
2. Failure to comply with this Memorandum and Order will result in dismissal of this matter as to Sedlak without further notice;
3. The Clerk of the court is directed to send to Sedlak the Form AO240, Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Affidavit; and

4. The Clerk of the court is directed to set a pro se case management deadline in this matter with the following text: May 24, 2012: Check for MIFP or payment.

DATED this 26th day of April, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

s/Laurie Smith Camp
Chief United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.